

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 54.—No. 8.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1825. [Price 1s.

TO THE  
PROTESTANTS OF ENGLAND.

*On the rejection of the Catholic  
Bill.*

Kensington, 19 May, 1825.

PROTESTANTS OF ENGLAND,

THE Bill, which was, more than two months ago, brought into the House of Commons, by Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, was, on Tuesday last, the 17th instant, thrown out, upon a motion for a second reading, in the House of Lords, by a majority of 48; there being for the Bill, 130, and against it, 178.

Upon this result the Morning Chronicle exclaims: "The *die* is cast." What *die*? There is nothing cast. Things are just as they were before, and they are

just what every man who understood the matter thought they would be. There is no *die* cast that had not been cast for many, many years. The Catholics have in vain applied for their rights, just as the *reformers* applied for theirs; both want to be *represented in Parliament*; and both have been refused; and refused both will be as long as those who now have the power to refuse with safety to themselves shall possess that power.

This is, however, an occasion for us, the Protestants of England, to consider a little *how our interests are connected with this Catholic affair*. But, before I make any remarks of that kind, let me call your recollection to those measures, which have been drolly enough denominated the *two wings* to this Bill. These wings, of the nature and tendency

P

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

of which I have already said enough in former Registers, were intended to cause the Bill to pass: they were an *offering*, a *sacrifice*; but, the offering was unavailing; it was rejected, and was made an argument *against* the Bill! And, as it was easy to foresee, the people at large, disliking the *wings*, almost *hoped*, that the Bill itself would be rejected for their sake. For my own part, I have no hesitation to say, that, rather than see the wings become *law*, I would see no Bill pass for the relief of the Catholics; being convinced, that the latter is best for the Catholics themselves.

And, as to the Bill itself, it was so full of bad matter, so full of injustice and of insult, to the Catholics and to their religion, that no man, who clearly understood its provisions, could be sorry to see it rejected. But, the *ground of the rejection* was not, that it was unjust or insulting. It was rejected, not because it was deemed *bad* for the Catholics, but because it was deemed *good* for them. There-

fore, though, all taken together, I think they have had an *escape*, we are to look upon this rejection as a refusal to do towards them that which I contend to be just. The *debate* upon this occasion was, in fact, no debate at all. There was nothing *new* said by anybody. There was nothing worthy of the name of argument. It was *power rejecting supplication*; and when did power *yield* to supplication? The speakers upon this occasion were, *for* the Bill, Lord DONOUGHMORE, who moved the second reading of the Bill; Lord LONDONDERRY, Lord CAMDEN, Lord DARNLEY, Lord CARBERRY, Lord LIMERICK, Lord HARROWBY, and Lord LANS-  
DOWN: and *against* it, Lord COLCHESTER, the Marquis of ANGLESEA, Lord LONGFORD, the Bishop of CHESTER, Lord LIVERPOOL, and the Lord CHANCELLOR.

The Bishop of Chester was the *chief spokesman*, and he really met the case in a fair and manly manner. The substance of his objections was, that the tendency of

the Bill would be to take away the *tithes and other property from the Clergy of the Established Church*; and, in short, to put down that Church; and, of course, to put an end to emoluments, in one shape and another, amounting, in Ireland, to about *three millions a-year*, and in England, to *about five or six millions a-year*. Take the whole at *eight millions a-year*; and here is quite a sufficiency to make the present possessors resolute in keeping possession.

But, the thing for us to consider, is, whether it is for *our interest*, that *we should pay* annually many millions a-year, out of the fruit of our labour, or, out of our incomes of whatever sort, in order to maintain an army, and the other parts of a system, necessary to cause these eight millions a year to be received by the Clergy of the Established Church. This is the plain question. It is a question that every man can understand; and that every man can answer if he will.

The case is this: the Catholic Church, when it existed throughout this whole kingdom, took care of the affairs of religion, and, at the same time, maintained all the poor. There were *no poor-rates* and *no church-rates*; and all the immense sums now wanted for those purposes, instead of being taken from the people at large, remained in their pockets to be enjoyed by them. A time came, when the tithes and other property were taken from the Catholic Church, and given to a Protestant Church and to a Protestant Aristocracy. Still there would be *poor*. In England *poor-rates* were established to supply the place of the charity of the Catholic Church. A grievous act of injustice towards the people at large; but it was better than to leave the indigent to perish. But, *in Ireland*, no *poor-rates* were established. The means of the Catholic Church were all taken away, and nothing created in their stead. Hence, and hence only, the Irish nation has, for now nearly three hundred



years, been more miserable than we, and the most miserable of any people in the world.

Owing to circumstances that it is not now necessary to state, the people of Ireland, all but a mere handful, have *continued to be Catholics*; and their being Catholics has been made the ground for their exclusion from posts of trust, and *particularly from Parliament*. No Catholic can sit in either House. This constitutes the great grievance; for, if Catholics could sit in Parliament, it is next to certain, that, out of the hundred members that Ireland sends to the Commons' House, *sixty or eighty* would be Catholics. The present Bill would have enabled Catholics to sit in Parliament; and, it is impossible that such a change should not have produced other changes with regard to Ireland, and also with regard to the state of the Established Church. Such a body of members must have had great weight; and, in a few years, must have produced something like that

which the Bishop of Chester seemed so much to dread.

The great charge against the Catholics, is, that they *dislike the Established Church*; and their great error, is, their *not openly avowing that dislike*. They are charged with a wish to *put down that Church*; and their great error is, *denying the charge*. For, if they wish that Church to exist; if they wish it to *prosper*; that is to say, if they wish it still to receive *eight millions a-year*; if they wish it still to receive *three millions a-year* even in Ireland, where there is scarcely a flock belonging to it; if they wish a parson to have the tithes of four or five parishes, in which there are not, perhaps, ten people that believe in the faith that he teaches; if these be their wishes, *what benefit* are we to see in any of the laws that they wish to be passed in their favour?

Doubtless they *do not wish these things*; and they are in error to affect to wish them. The strength of their adversaries is derived from their want of openly and explicitly



avowing their real wishes. The Bishop of Chester would have been stripped of all his charges, if they had been open and bold. He said, that *they pretended that they did not want to hurt the Established Church*. He then set himself to work to show, that they *did want to hurt it*; and, whatever his proofs might be, we could readily believe the fact; because it *must be true*. If they had spoken out, he would have had quite a different task to perform. He would have had to show, that the Established Church was *a thing that ought to be upheld!* And this he would have found a matter of *great difficulty*; while he found no difficulty at all in making it out, that the Catholics wished to see that Church put down.

The language of the Irish Catholics to the Parliament ought to have been this: You took away the tithes and the other property of our Church; you gave these to a Protestant Clergy, whom you sent hither with your Prayer-Book;

you made no provision for the relief of our poor, who were formerly relieved by our Church; you took away from us all the means of preventing misery; your Clergy were to convert us to the new religion; but, at the end of three hundred years, here we are a Catholic people still, paying tithes and Church rates, to a Church which gives us neither religion, nor relief for the poor. We are six millions in number, making a full third part of the population of the kingdom; we are greater in number than all the people of the Established Church in the whole kingdom; we think it monstrously unjust that this Catholic people should continue to support this Protestant Church; and we pray, that, as this Church was "established by law," as it was made by Acts of Parliament, it may be *unmade* by an Act of Parliament; that its immense revenues, which once belonged to us, and which are now possessed by a Clergy who have scarcely any flocks, may be applied to public purposes

and that, this bone of contention being removed, we ourselves may be admitted to all posts of trust, honour and power, under that form of Government, which was established by Catholics, and upheld by them for so many ages.

This would have been the language of *truth*, of *sense*, of *reason*, and would have had due effect upon us all. And, observe, that, until such language be the language of the Catholics, they will produce little effect by their supplications. I should like to hear the answer that the Bishop of Chester would have given to a petition of this import. I should like to hear him endeavour to make it out, that it is just and politic to keep an army on foot to compel a people to uphold a religion that they abhor; that it is for the good of a nation to maintain a Church in the faith of which it does not believe; that it tends to the safety of a state to cause a third part of its people to sigh for events that must weaken its power.

Mr. CANNING said, that he would *never* consent to *touch the tithes* of the Church in Ireland; and yet he was for putting *Catholics in Parliament!* If that be his resolution, it is little short of madness to propose to give the Catholics *power*. It is now thirteen years since an Irish gentleman spoke to me about the means to be used to obtain "*emancipation*." I suppose, said I, you *want to get rid of the Protestant Church*. "Oh, no!" said he, "we only want to be *emancipated* ourselves." Well, then, said I, if that be the case, *I do not wish to have any thing to do with your cause*; for, I am sure, it is all *nonsense*. I urged him to assure the Catholics of Ireland, that they never would make any impression in England, unless they could show us, that they wanted to do something more than merely to put men of their Church into certain posts and into Parliament; that they would never make us see how the condition of the suffering people of Ireland

was to be altered for the better by any such trifling measure. And this is the real state of the case now. People in general do not see, and they never will see, that there is any practical good likely to arise from the advancement of a few men. It is a monstrous oppression on us to be compelled to support an army, a great standing army, in time of peace, solely for the purpose of keeping our fellow-subjects in Ireland *in order*. It is a horrid thing to think of, that a considerable part of the people in that fine country are shut up in their houses from sunset to sunrise. It is still more horrid to reflect that a large part of the people, that whole millions of them are in a state of such destitution as to food and raiment, that it has been thought advisable to 'carry' some of them away to the wilds of America. But, common sense says, that evils like these are not to be cured by opening the way to honours and emoluments to a few distinguished Catholics.

There must be a *great deal more than this*, though this is just, too. The great evil, the root of all the evil, is, the existence of a Church, to which the people do not belong. It is not only a Church to which they do not belong, but a Church which takes so large a part of their earnings from them, which gives them not an ort in the way of relief; and, which possesses property which *once was theirs*, and which they lost, only because they adhered to the faith of their fathers, who founded and endowed that Church. Talk of "*educating*" the people, indeed! Talk of "*enlightening*" them! Why, the more they are "*enlightened*," as it is called, the better will they be read in *the history of their wrongs*. They are to be taught, say these enlighteners; they are to be taught to read, in order that they may *cease to be Catholics*. Why, they can now read much *more than formerly*, or else all this school-work has been going on in vain. The fair probability is, that where one



could read a hundred years ago one hundred can read now. And it is notorious, that they are now Catholics in a greater proportion than they were a hundred years ago. The truth is, that they find, as they read, that the Protestant Church has made their country a country of misery; that it has always worked mischief to them; that it is almost against nature for them to refrain from hating it; and, how, then, are they to be induced to love it by reading about it?

They know too well, that they are miserable; they know, that no labour, no care, no frugality, will save them from horrid want; they know, that they are half-naked and half-starved in the midst of plenty; and, if they read, they will know, that their forefathers were not thus, and that before this Protestant Church was known amongst them, they were as happy as the English; they will know that their own church took care of the indigent; that it was the protector of the innocent and the feeder of the

widow and the orphan. How, therefore, is the "education" to tend to make them contented with this state of things? Contented they never can be, while this Protestant Church exists in their country; and, surely, as this church might be repealed with a great deal more ease than it was enacted, it ought to be repealed, and that, too, without loss of time.

It is, perhaps, a great deal too much to hope, that the Catholics, after having, for so many many years, acted as if they felt the foot actually upon their necks; it is, perhaps, too much to hope, that they will now assume an open and manly tone and manner of proceeding; but, if they were to do it, they would soon experience all the natural and just rewards of such tone and manner. It is curious enough to observe the numerous arts which they have practised, in order to deprive themselves of the fellow-feeling of the English. Whenever we have been anxious about our rights, they have endeavoured, or seemed to

endeavour, to ingratiate themselves with the Government by standing aloof from us! CASTLEREAGH, who cut his own throat at North Cray in Kent, congratulated his hearers that the people of Ireland *despised the reformers* and their cause; and the same "great statesman," when he called the people of England, who so nobly upheld the ill-treated QUEEN, the "*basest populace*," not being then aware, I dare say, that the time was so near at hand, when they would send *him off* with such a triumphant shout; this same "great statesman," every way so worthy of being the *leader* of those whom he led; when he called the humane, just, and public-spirited people of England the "*basest populace*," he had the "satisfaction to notice the *content and tranquillity that prevailed in Ireland*."

Thus has it invariably been. That which has been interesting to us, has always appeared to be matter of indifference with the Irish; and this has been the prin-

cipal cause, of late days, of every oppression of which they have complained. Thirteen years ago, when Sir Francis Burdett was applied to to do something relating to the Catholic question, as it was called, his answer was in these words: "No; your Catholic question, considered independently of everything else, is not worth a straw to the kingdom, nor even to the Catholic people themselves. Let the Catholics *join us* heartily and cordially in the CAUSE OF REFORM; let their priests make a stand along with us, as the Catholic Bishops did in the reign of King John, and they will soon get Catholic Emancipation; but they never will till then." This was his answer; and in almost these very words, in the year 1811 or 1812.

How different must his sentiments be now! He was right then; but his advice was not followed; and, as I have just observed, it would really seem to have been the settled design of the Catholics, to stand aloof from the people of

England at all times when they were making the most strenuous exertions for the recovery or the support of their rights.

If, taught by melancholy experience, they were now to change their tone and their manner of proceeding, and were to join the people of England, they would soon find the happy consequences. There is a general desire existing to lessen the enormous burden imposed on us by this Established Church. It is a thing that yields nothing; that gives up no part of its enjoyments. The landlord is pared down in his estate. People of all ranks are obliged to make sacrifices, except the Clergy. They give up nothing. They do not even contribute towards the erection of the edifices, out of which new emoluments to them arise. Hundreds upon hundreds of country parishes even in England, are nearly deserted, and the inhabitants go to swell the size of large cities and towns. The Clergy keep all the tithes of those parishes; receive additional tithes in the large cities and towns; and, while the country churches are suffered to fall down, the new churches necessary in the cities and great towns are built, not at the expense of the Clergy as they ought to be; but at the expense

of the people at large. There prevails a general sentiment, that this Church ought to be pared down in its revenues; and, in short, that the whole of those revenues ought to be applied to public purposes, and the Ministry maintained in the manner that they are in France. It is curious enough, that on the very night on which the Catholic Bill was rejected in the House of Lords, the City of London Tithe Bill was rejected in the House of Commons. That Bill was an application to the House to relieve the City from the enormous burden of two and ninepence in the pound on the rack-rent, imposed in the reign of Henry the Eighth, by a set of Commissioners of whom Cranmer was one. The burden is the offspring of the Protestant "*Reformation*." But even the reformers of religion never intended it to be what it is. Nevertheless, the Clergy avail themselves of the mistake, and the Petitioners for redress are compelled to submit. It was urged against the Bill, and with great truth, that this two and ninepence in the pound stood upon the same footing as all the rest of the Church property; and that to petition against it was to petition against the existence of all that property. "Agreed," say



the English nation. We are all ready to agree in this; and, if the nation were polled, there would be found not one man out of one hundred who would not be ready to see the principle adopted. The existence of this Establishment is wholly incompatible with the pecuniary state of the kingdom. Something *must* give way. Tithes, church-lands, crown-lands, pensions, sinecures, grants, salaries, army, navy, or debt or "*dead-weight*"; something or other must give way. Little nibblings have been made at the debt; but, the first moment of pressure, there must be a large sweeping there, unless something else give way; and, with one undivided voice, the people say, **LET US BEGIN WITH THE CHURCH!** There has been much talk about the expense, which it was proposed to put the nation to, on account of the Catholic Clergy. I disapproved of that measure. It was bad for several reasons; but, what a shame was it to talk of the expense, when we had before us the fact, that for sixteen successive years, a hundred thousand pounds a-year, was voted out of the taxes for the "*relief*" of the poor Clergy of the Established Church, whose congregations do not form a third part of the people of the

kingdom, and whose revenues, at the very least, amount to *eight millions a-year!* Mr. BANKES desired gentlemen to think of the expense of this allowance to the Catholic Clergy, which, he said, would be a *heavy burden* on the consolidated fund; but, did Mr. BANKES ever utter one single word against the charge on the consolidated fund, occasioned by these wanton, these shameless grants of public money to relieve the *poor* Clergy of the richest Church that ever existed upon the face of the earth; many of whose rectors receive more than seven thousand pounds a-year each, and several of whose Bishops receive each of them more than thirty thousand pounds a-year? These sixteen hundred thousand pounds, this more than a million and a half of sovereigns, make part of the present DEBT. The debt would not be so large by a million and a half, had it not been for those grants. The fundholders have had a little nipping, and yet not a word has been said about these sixteen hundred thousand pounds. But, can there be another deduction from the DEBT, without something being done with regard to this sum of money? Is the Church to keep this sum? In short, all men are of opinion, that,

if deduction be to take place in any quarter, resort ought to be had, first of all, to this enormous mass of property.

I now return to the Catholics, and to the conduct which they ought in future to pursue. They ought to quit, for good and all, their habit of standing aloof from us. They ought to be amongst the foremost to demand a redress of grievances of all sorts; and particularly a redress of that great grievance, the want of a popular representation in the House of Commons. We very frequently present petitions on the subject of Ireland; but the Irish, as if they felt no interest in our fate, never *mention us in any of their petitions*. If any monstrous outrage is committed against them, the people of England are always ready to feel for them, to cry out against their oppressors, and to check as far as possible the strides of power against them. When we petition, we petition for the whole kingdom; they invariably confine their complaints to their own concerns. Let them join us then; let them petition, whether we do or not, against the continuance of this enormous mass of property, which is now in the hands of the Established Church. They will soon find, that we shall *hasten to*

*join them here*. This is a matter which we clearly understand; and the Bishop of Chester would have something else to do than to make long statements in order to show, that the Catholics wish to overturn the establishment.

The Established Church owes its existence to acts of Parliament. Certain Acts of Parliament, passed principally in the reigns of Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, and that lovely and chaste and humane creature, Queen Elizabeth. A Church that can be made by law, can be unmade by law. A Church which stood upon rights imprescriptible, which was upheld by charters reiterated, and by divers Acts passed during a period of nine hundred years, was put down by Acts of Parliament. It was proscribed, and became non-existent in law. It is, therefore, the most impudent thing in the world to pretend that the same Parliament has not the power and the right to unmake this new Church. Let the Catholics of Ireland, therefore, state their case to this Parliament. Let them represent that this new Church takes all the tithes, all the property, of the old Church; that the old Church maintained its own edifices, erected new ones when necessary, kept all its buildings in

repair, provided hospitable entertainment for the stranger. Constantly communicated relief and comfort to the poor and indigent; and that the new Church do none of these things, but, call upon the people for Church-rates, in Ireland as well as in England; and leave the poor in Ireland to perish with nakedness and hunger, and call upon the people in England to provide for the poor out of their earnings and incomes. Let them represent that, particularly in Ireland, the people are compelled to pay large sums of money (they belonging to the old Church still), to erect Churches for the Parsons of the new Church, instead of those which those Parsons have suffered to fall down, while those Parsons have, all the while, been receiving the tithes of the parish. Let them represent, as was represented in a Petition presented to the House of Commons only yesterday, by Mr. BROUGHAM, that "three hundred Catholics of AGHADEE, prayed that they might not be compelled to build a Church for the Protestant Reverend Mr. GRIERSON;" and, as Mr. BROUGHAM observed, prayed that these three hundred Catholic subjects might not be compelled to build a Church for *one Protestant*

*individual*. Let them represent that this Established Church has not congregations which form any thing like a third part of the people of the kingdom. Let them represent that there have grown up under it, a dozen or two of religions; that, in almost every village of the kingdom, there is a meeting-house of some sort or other whose congregation surpasses in numerousness the congregation of the Church. Let them represent that the religious education of the people, which is a matter that ought to be effectually provided for by a Church and its Ministers, is now transferred to a School-Society; that His Majesty has been advised to issue a rescript for a general collection of money for the support of this Society, that the Bishops, in communicating this rescript to their Clergy, have directed them to transmit the amount of the collections to a wine and spirit merchant in London. Let them represent, that, such being the case, the eight millions a-year which are now received by the Clergy of this Church can no longer be necessary to the purposes of religion. Let them represent, that, in Ireland, where the Catholic Clergy are supported by voluntary donations, the people are almost wholly



Catholic; that the mongrel sects make no progress amongst them; that the few that there were of those sects are there becoming still fewer; and that though there are such numerous temptations to the quitting of the ancient faith, the religion of the country has been maintained in greater purity, and its teachers are of a character more exemplary, than in any other country of which we have any knowledge. Let the Catholics of Ireland make these representations to the Parliament; let them thus openly and explicitly state the wishes of their hearts; let them conclude by praying that this establishment, this enormous expense to the kingdom, which is now so perfectly useless to the purposes of religion, may no longer exist. Let them do this; and they will find themselves joined by the Protestants of England; and if so joined, they will soon look back to the days of the talk about Catholic emancipation, with that sort of feeling with which the grown-up man looks back to the little fooleries of his childhood.

To a representation like this, the BISHOP of CHESTER would find it very embarrassing to give any answer at all. This would be taking him upon entirely new

ground. It would be in vain for him to talk about the POPE, about "*divided allegiance*," or about transubstantiation. He would be unable to amuse his hearers by observations on the *secret* designs of Dr. DOYLE, or of any other doctor. There would be no secrets for the Right Reverend Gentleman to deal with. He would have flatly to contradict the allegations; and then he must come to disproof of the facts alleged, or, at the least, call upon the parties to prove them; and if they did prove them, he must give way. If he admitted the facts to be true, then he must enter into a defence of the thing as it is alleged to exist. He must show that it is right for the new church to take all the tithes, and all the other property of the old church, and to make the people at large pay church-rates and poor-rates besides. He must contend, that it is right for the present clergy to take the revenues of the church, let the churches fall down, and then make the people build them up again. He must contend that this is quite just and reasonable, and that it is also just and reasonable that the whole kingdom should be compelled to contribute towards the support of this new church, though it does not number a

third part of the people in its congregations.

This would be something for the Bishop to have to do. Here there would be no splitting of hairs about Dr. DOYLE's evidence, compared with Dr. DOYLE's pamphlet. Here there would be no ground for cavil about allegiance to the POPE, and about the power and influence of bulls received from ROME. This would be plain matter-of-fact work; and it would be preparing the minds of the people for a resort to this immense mass of wealth *before another penny were taken from those who are called the national creditors!* The time must come (and let Catholics bear it well in mind); the time must come when something must be done with regard to this DEBT. Every man must see that it will be impossible to face another war, and to leave this Debt upon its present footing. The thing is absolutely impossible. Another touch at the paper-money, such as was tried last war, never can take place. Means must be had, if war come, and come it will, in spite of the money-making knaves with broad brims. The question will be, then; whence are to come these means. Without extraordinary means, the DEBT and "DEAD-WEIGHT" must be swept away

in great part. I have very little feeling for the Jews; and I think the *Dead-Weight* greatly overpaid. But, still, the two classes of persons include great numbers that it would be cruel, and, what is worse, manifestly unjust to plunge into ruin and misery. Before, therefore, I would touch either of those classes; before I would deduct from either one single penny, I would bring to the hammer all the public property of the nation. Amongst its public property is the property called Church property. Here are eight millions a-year of real property, *amounting to about a fourth part of the whole of the interest of the Debt!* Here is a resource, indeed! And this is *real property*, mind. It is property clearly belonging to the nation. It is not at all of the nature of private property. The possessors are merely life-holders. They are exactly upon the footing of those who hold sinecures for life. An Act was passed in the year 1817 (I think it was) to put an end to sinecures, reserving the rights of the present possessors. I must stop here to observe that the timid, the selfish, and ungrateful part of this nation, the base *Egoists*, as the French well denominated them, who applauded this Act, and who

had the incomparable insincerity and rascality to ascribe it to the justice of CASTLEREAGH and Co., knew as well as I did, that the Act was produced wholly, completely, exclusively, by the CALUMNIATED REFORMERS, and particularly, at least, more than by any other *one* man, *by myself*, who had harped upon these sinecures, who had taught the Reformers to harp upon them in their petitions and their speeches, till the names of BUCKINGHAM, CAMDEN, ELLENBOROUGH, WELLESLEY, SOMERSET, ABBOTT, now Lord COLCHESTER, PAGET, and scores of others, had become familiar round every cottage fire-side in the kingdom. We had rung the peal in the ears of the Honourable House till it became irresistible; and, let the Catholics take a lesson from this. The heroes of Saint Stephen's affected to despise us; but they passed a Bill to abolish sinecures. By saving the rights of the present possessors, they thought, perhaps, that much harm would not be done; but they passed the Bill; and the sinecure system will never flourish again as long as England is England.

They passed a law to abolish sinecures. And why not pass a law to abolish rectories, vicar-

ages, perpetual curacies, deaneries, prebendaries, bishoprics, and all the rest of it? This is an important matter; and, therefore, I shall, somewhat contrary to my usual practice, resort to an authority. In my Letters to the King, published last fall, I showed very clearly, that there would be no violation of right, in abolishing the Church establishment. I noticed the strange doctrine of Mr. PLUNKETT, that the Church property stood upon the same foundation as private property. I showed how the Church property had been meddled with; how it had been disposed of, how, by a series of Acts of Parliament, coming down to a very recent date, the Parliament had dealt with this property at its pleasure. But, as I am now calling upon Catholics to do their duty with respect to this property, I shall resort to an authority such as I am sure none of the able friends of the Catholics, at any rate, will call in question; I mean that of Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH, who, in his *Vindicæ Gallicæ*, page 85, has the following passage. I beg the reader's attention to it; for, as far as regards our Church, at any rate, it is completely unanswerable.

"But dismissing the genealogy



" of doctrines, let us examine  
 " their intrinsic value, and listen  
 " to no voice but that of truth.  
 " 'ARE THE LANDS OCCU-  
 " PIED BY THE CHURCH  
 " THE PROPERTY OF ITS  
 " MEMBERS?' Various con-  
 " siderations present themselves  
 " which may elucidate the sub-  
 " ject.—It has not hitherto been  
 " supposed that any class of  
 " *public servants* are proprietors.  
 " They are *salaried* by the State  
 " for the performance of certain  
 " duties. Judges are *paid* for the  
 " distribution of justice; *Kings*  
 " for the execution of the laws;  
 " soldiers, where there is a mer-  
 " cenary army, for public defence;  
 " and Priests, where there is an  
 " established religion, for public  
 " instruction. The mode of their  
 " *payment* is different to the ques-  
 " tion. It is generally in rude  
 " ages by land, and in cultivated  
 " periods by money. But a *terri-*  
 " *torial pension* is no more pro-  
 " perty than a *pecuniary one*.  
 " The right of the State to regu-  
 " late the salaries of those *ser-*  
 " *vants*, whom it pays in money,  
 " has not been disputed. But if  
 " it has *chosen to provide the re-*  
 " *venue of a certain portion of*  
 " *land for the salary of another*  
 " *class of servants*, wherefore is  
 " its right more disputable, to re-

" sume that land, and to establish  
 " a new mode of payment? In  
 " the early history of Europe,  
 " before fiefs became hereditary,  
 " great landed estates were be-  
 " stowed by the Sovereign, on con-  
 " dition of military service. By  
 " a similar tenure did the church  
 " hold its lands. No man can  
 " prove, that because the State has  
 " entrusted its ecclesiastical ser-  
 " vants with a portion of land, as  
 " the source and security of their  
 " *pensions*, they are in any re-  
 " spect more the *proprietors* of it,  
 " than the other servants of the  
 " State are of that portion of the  
 " revenue from which they are  
 " paid. The lands of the Church  
 " possess not the most simple and  
 " indispensable requisites of pro-  
 " perty. They are not even pre-  
 " tended to be held for the *benefit*  
 " of those that enjoy them. This  
 " is the obvious intention between  
 " private property and a pension  
 " for public service. The desti-  
 " nation of the first is avowedly  
 " the comfort and happiness of  
 " the *individual* who enjoys it;  
 " as he is conceived to be the sole  
 " judge of this happiness, he pos-  
 " sesses the most unlimited rights  
 " of enjoyment, alienation, and  
 " even abuse; but the lands of  
 " the Church, destined for the  
 " support of public servants, ex-

"hibit none of the characters of  
 "property. They were inalien-  
 "able, because it would have been  
 "not less absurd for the priest-  
 "hood to have exercised such  
 "authority over these lands, than  
 "it would for seamen to claim the  
 "property of a fleet which they  
 "manned, or soldiers that of a  
 "fortress they garrisoned. It  
 "is confessed that no individual  
 "priest was a proprietor, and it is  
 "not denied that his utmost claim  
 "was limited to a possession for  
 "life of his stipend. If all the  
 "priests, taken *individually*, were  
 "not proprietors, the priesthood,  
 "as a *body*, cannot claim any  
 "such right. For what is a *body*,  
 "but an aggregate of individuals,  
 "and what new right can be con-  
 "veyed by a mere change of  
 "name?—Nothing can so forc-  
 "ibly illustrate this argument as  
 "the case of other corporations.  
 "They are voluntary associations  
 "of men for their own benefit.  
 "Every member of them is an  
 "absolute sharer in their property,  
 "it is therefore alienated and in-  
 "herited. Corporate property  
 "is here as sacred as individual,  
 "because in the ultimate analysis  
 "it is the same. But the priest-  
 "hood is a corporation, endowed  
 "by the country, and destined  
 "for the benefit of other men. It

"is hence that the members have  
 "no *separate*, nor the body any  
 "collective, right of property.  
 "They are only entrusted with  
 "the *administration* of the lands  
 "from which their *salaries* are  
 "paid.—It is from this last cir-  
 "cumstance that their *legal sem-*  
 "*blance* of property arises. In  
 "charters, bonds, and all other  
 "proceedings of law, they are  
 "treated with the same formal-  
 "ties as real property.—‘They  
 "are identified,’ says Mr. Burke,  
 "‘with the mass of private pro-  
 "perty;’ and it must be confessed,  
 "that if we are to limit our view  
 "to forms, this language is  
 "correct. But, the repugnance  
 "of these formalities to le-  
 "gal truth, proceeded from a  
 "very obvious cause. If estates  
 "are vested in the Clergy, to  
 "them most unquestionably ought  
 "to be entrusted the protection of  
 "these estates in all contests at  
 "law, and actions for that pur-  
 "pose can only be maintained  
 "with facility, simplicity, and  
 "effect, by the *fiction* of their  
 "being *proprietors*. Nor is this  
 "the only case in which the spirit  
 "and the forms of law are at  
 "variance respecting property.  
 "Scotland, where lands still are  
 "held by *feudal* tenures, will  
 "afford us a remarkable example.

" There, if we extend our views  
 " no farther than legal forms, the  
 " *superior* is to be regarded as the  
 " proprietor, while the real pro-  
 " prietor appears to be only a  
 " tenant for life. Such is the  
 " language of the charter, by  
 " which he obtains a legal right  
 " to his estate. In this case, the  
 " vassal is *formally* stript of the  
 " property which he in fact en-  
 " joys. In the other, the Church  
 " is *formally* invested with a pro-  
 " perty, to which in reality it had  
 " no claim. The argument of  
 " *prescription* will appear alto-  
 " gether untenable; for *prescrip-*  
 " *tion implies a certain period,*  
 " *during which the rights of pro-*  
 " *perty had been exercised;* but in  
 " the case before us they *never*  
 " were exercised, because they  
 " never could be supposed to ex-  
 " ist. It must be proved that these  
 " possessions were of the nature  
 " of property, before it can follow  
 " that they are protected by pre-  
 " scription, and to plead it is to  
 " take for granted the question in  
 " dispute. If they never were  
 " property, no length of time can  
 " change their nature."

After this, I think our consciences may be pretty quiet while we are applying this mass of property to the payment of the poor fund-holders, and the "*Dead-Weight.*"

Let it be observed, too, that Sir JAMES had a much more difficult case to handle than we have. He had to justify the ousting of possessors, who held by a tenure *fifteen or sixteen hundred years old.* They held by rights which were perfectly imprescriptible; whereas we can point to the Act of Parliament from which our Clergy derive their claim. They have not the shadow of a pretension other than that which is founded on acts of this very Parliament. They have no POPE's authority for their holding. They can plead no treaty with foreign powers. They are mere possessors in virtue of a written law, every word of which law we can refer to, as easily as we can to the Turnpike Act, which enables the Trustees of the Kensington-road to take toll of us at their bar-gate at Hyde Park Corner. The two cases are not altogether dissimilar, for the Church Establishment is now much about as necessary to the well-being of the Irish nation as that gate is to the proper necessary and judicious repair of the Kensington-road. Sir JAMES had to deal with a very ancient affair. Great masses of rights were involved in his concern. Directly and indirectly, the possession of the Church property in France



affected the possession and the value of other property unquestionably private. He had to deal also with *communities* of clerical possessors. Those communities stood upon ground very different from that on which the incumbents of our Church stand. They had *never died*, from their first creation. Some part of the community was always alive. Whereas, when a Protestant parson is dead, there is a vacancy takes place, another is appointed in his stead, but it is not the same body. Then, again, there were the *rights of the founders*. Theirs was *private property*. They had *corrodies*, and various other rights, in which they participated, in some degree, with the religious possessors of the estates of the community. Yet Sir JAMES finds no obstacle here. There were, besides, certain *vows*, which were sanctioned by law. These vows were of a private nature, at any rate. No power on earth could be exercised justly, if it compelled a man to *break his vow*. Yet neither does Sir JAMES find any obstacle here. Indeed, every thing that Sir JAMES justifies, he had a precedent for in the Protestant Reformation of England; in which Reformation, no regard whatever

was paid to any rights, private or public, if those rights were connected with Church property. Again, Sir JAMES had to deal with possessions which were *conditional*. When a convent was founded, there were conditions attached, by the founder, to the possession of the estate and the enjoyment of the revenues. One of the conditions generally was, that mass should be said, at such and such times, in the convent. Another condition generally was, that such and such offices of charity should be performed. Very frequently the foundations were in virtue of the will of the founder, so that, here was a violation of private compact; a violation of wills. The masses were to be said, in most cases, for the *repose of the souls of certain persons*. Property was, therefore, thus applied to certain specific purposes; and it was as much a violation of private property to deprive a dead man of the benefit of the mass, as it was to deprive any man of his estate that he inhabited or purchased, and that he possessed at his death. No matter what we Protestants may think about these masses, agreeably to the law, the will of the founder was to be obeyed, the condition of the will was to be performed; or, the property was

beyond all question to revert to the heir of him or her by whom the request was made. Now, there were, in France, hundreds upon hundreds of persons, who could trace back the foundation of monasteries to those of whom these persons were the heirs at law. Unquestionably the heirs. Proof of heirship as clear as daylight. The monasteries, therefore, reverted to them, together with all the estates. But, that monster of boundless maw, "*La Nation*," swallowed up all; and Sir JAMES justifies the deed.

Very different is the situation of our incumbents. They have no prescription to plead; they have the wills of no founders to refer to; they have no heirship to plead; no condition is attached to the possession of that which they enjoy; that is to say, no condition to screen it from the hands of the public. At the time of the Protestant "*Reformation*," indeed, all these circumstances existed to bar the claim of the public, and all these circumstances were disregarded. Our Church incumbents, therefore, are, as Sir JAMES has it, mere *public servants*; merely persons employed by the Government, and paid in rents, instead of a salary, and with whom a bargain is made, that they shall con-

tinue so to be paid for their lives upon condition of their performing certain services. The public standing no longer in need of their services, or not wishing to have their services any longer, has, in pursuance of the right which it possesses in common with all other employers, the power of lawfully discharging them.

I should be willing to let the present incumbents retire upon a salary, but not a salary in amount equal to that of their present revenues; because that would be giving for no service at all, as much as was given them for services, or supposed services. Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH justified the reducing of great numbers of gentlemen to something very little short of beggars. This is precisely what was done in England at the time of the Protestant "*Reformation*," which Reformation has been chanted to the skies by the present parsons and their predecessors. I think it would be by no means unjust to give these incumbents a sufficiency to maintain them for life in a decent manner. Not a sufficiency for them to live in a luxurious way; but I do not think that the country would gain any thing by acting towards them with any degree of cruelty; and to reduce them to mere apostolical al-

lowance would certainly be cruel. In short, it would be unworthy of the character of the country to adopt towards them a course of proceeding either niggardly or harsh.

But, there is private property in the advowsons; that is to say, in the right of presentation. You will see that Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH pays no regard to these; and you will observe, also, that no regard was paid to them at the time of the Protestant "*Reformation*." The public, or rather, the tyrant and his myrmidons, seized upon the whole. The right of presentation belonged, for instance, in certain cases to monasteries. They were the owners of the advowsons. This ownership was taken from them. Though granted to them by individuals, either by deed or by will. The present possessors of advowsons hold them by the same tenure that the first possessor held them at the time of the Protestant "*Reformation*." They sell them openly by advertisement in the newspapers. They are an article of traffic as much as any sort of goods or merchandize. — They are private property, as the law now stands. They are practically private property; but, if Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH's doctrine

be sound, even they are not private property in principle. They are by no means so much private property as the monasteries in France were. The tenure of them partakes of all the defects not only of the title which the French monks, according to Sir JAMES, had to their possession; but of the further defect arising out of the character of the proceedings in the reign of Henry the Eighth. The same may be said of all the *lay impropriations*. I do not go to Sir JAMES's length. I do not say that these things are not private property. I do not say that they ought to be seized on by the public; but, if Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH's doctrine be good, these also belong to the public.

At any rate, that part of the property of the ancient Church, which is in the hands of those public servants called Parsons, and so forth, and which public servants, the Government has thought proper to pay in the use of land, instead of paying them in money, belongs unquestionably to the nation at large; and that body of lawgivers, which has a right to make laws for the nation, has a full and complete right to dispose of this property in whatever manner it shall please. Viewing the incumbents as public



servants, the public is not bound to provide for these servants; but it seems equitable to do it, and, therefore, I would be a party to no measure that did not contemplate such provision. We know very well the manner in which many of them have become possessed of these life-holds; but, it would be difficult to discriminate. There must be some general regulation; and if that regulation were just, no incumbent would have a right to complain.

Thus, then, the principle is as clear as day-light. As to *sacrilege*, Sir JAMES says that he knows nothing of the matter. He rejoices at the "conversion of an immense public property, and at the reduction of a *servile* and *imperious* priesthood to humble utility, as the moral and religious instructors of mankind." As the DUKE of YORK says, I, "so help me God," if I were in the place of the Catholics, would commit my petition to the hands of Sir JAMES. He would be the man to convince the Parliament of the great utility of such reduction in our own country. Established bodies of Priests, Sir JAMES tells us, when in "a state of feebleness, are dangerous to liberty; possessed of power, they are dangerous to civil govern-

"ment itself." Sir JAMES, therefore, should present my petition, if I were a Catholic. Never was there a priesthood so rich as that of this Established Church. Never was there such a mass of property in the hands of any corporation; and Sir JAMES must be a turncoat indeed, if he would not cheerfully lend his hand to the conversion of this property to national utility.

What then have the Catholics to do, and the Catholics of Ireland, especially, but to demand, in terms sufficiently respectful, the conversion of this property to public purposes? Let them not be impatient. They have had patience to send petitions for five and twenty years. They can wait a little longer surely for the time when the nation will sensibly feel that it wants the means which these "*public servants*" have in their hands. The time must come; the time may be very near at hand, when resort must be had either to reduction of the interest of the DEBT, or to the discovery of extraordinary resources. The Catholics should therefore begin; and begin *immediately*, too. They ought not to let the Parliament separate before they send something, which the Bishop of Chester may take home with him, and

effect on during the vacation. A regular statement of all the reasons for the *repeal* of this Church. An enumeration of all the Acts of Parliament by which the Church was made, and by which this mass of property has been placed in its hands. I would go back to the Protestant "*Reformation*." I would stick to the temporalities. I would say nothing about doctrines or discipline. Nothing at all about transubstantiation or consubstantiation. I would talk about lands and tenements, and advowsons and manors. I would state the amount of the Church property. I would state the fair claims which the Catholics have to participate in all the great benefits which must inevitably arise from the discharging of these public servants, and from the application of their revenues to those purposes which are useful to the public, and which application would, I will venture say, go very far in relieving the Government from that necessity which now actually compels it to make corn dear. Lastly, I would state that this measure would also render a large part of the present army unnecessary. Various other heavy expenses it would also cause to be spared; and I question not, that it might be clearly shown, that a

resumption of this property would by saving on the one hand, and additional revenue on the other hand, take from the present amount of taxes not less than from fourteen to sixteen millions a year. Not to mention the peace and happiness which it would restore to Ireland; not to mention the security which it would give to the kingdom in case of war; and not to mention, moreover, the diminution which it would make in the disposition of foreign powers to do any thing to insult us and to involve us in those troubles which are inseparable from hostility.

This is my advice to the Catholics. I advise them by no means to give way to *lamentation*; and never again to think of obtaining redress by humility. Prayers and supplications never yet obtained justice in such a case as this. Their language ought to be full of resolution, not to say indignation. Their wrongs are without a parallel in duration as well as in magnitude. For three hundred years they and their religion have been a subject of calumny. Experience of the bitter fruits of the policy of their foes has rather tended to harden than to soften those foes. This is perfectly natural; but, it is not to be counter-

acted by humility. Meekness never yet softened the asperity of the wrongdoer; and my surprise is that any thing like meekness should ever be apparent in the conduct of an Irish Catholic.

As to ourselves, the Protestants of England, we suffer, though not in the same degree, from this ill-treatment of our Catholic fellow-subjects. All manner of vile arts have been made use of to make us regard them, not only as idolaters, and as people following a wicked system of religion; but to make us look upon them as a sort of foreigners; a sort of *interlopers*, having no clear right to be in this kingdom at all. Our ancient, habitual, and, indeed, well-grounded dislike of the French, our nearest neighbour and most formidable enemy, has very materially served the cause of the foes of the Catholics. The French have always been Catholics. The Catholic religion is the *French religion*; and that is enough with the far greater part of Englishmen. It is a foreign religion. Ours is the "*Church of England*." That is a very powerful phrase; a very excellent name; and has, perhaps, done more for that Church than all other things put together; we have identified the name of the Church with the name

of the country; so that from one of the best of all possible sentiments, we derive one of the worst of all possible consequences. The main part of Englishmen have hardly regarded it as possible for a Catholic to be an Englishman. If we could get at our countrymen one by one, and say: "why, all those Englishmen who fought so many glorious battles in France, all those who won the famous victories of which we are so proud, those who caused a King of England to be crowned at Paris; these were all Catholics. Those were Catholics, too, who caused Magna Charta to be signed. Nothing has ever been achieved by Protestants to be at all put in comparison with the achievements of Catholics." If we could get at them, man by man, and tell them these things, and explain to them how well the people of England were clothed and fed as long as the Catholic religion was the religion of the country. If we could make them see how it is that they have been deceived, and for what vile purposes and by what execrable means the deception has been kept up, the delusion would vanish in a twinkling; but, this is not to be done in a week, in a month, nor in a year. Of one thing the Ca-



tholics may be well assured; and that is, that it is never to be accomplished by *humility*. They need never expect to remove the effects of a long-told lie by acting upon the defensive. They must attack their foes, reproach them with falsehood and malignity and selfishness and hypocrisy. They must dare those foes to a comparison of the effects of the two religions upon the country. They must treat them as persons beneath themselves, and not as persons to be prayed to and supplicated with fear and trembling. Only think of Catholics, *worth twenty or thirty thousand pounds a-year*, suffering the people of England to believe, that Catholics *can hardly be Englishmen!*

They should dwell, and repeatedly dwell upon the power which they will possess in cases of difficulty and danger. In every word and in every act, they should convince their enemies that they are full of just resentment, and that they will neglect no opportunity, approach them from whatever quarter it may, to gratify that just resentment. There are some wrongs that men may overlook altogether, and there are others which they may safely let pass with slight notice. The wrongs which the Catholics have en-

dured and which they still endure, are not of this character. They are of a nature which makes it disgraceful to submit to without discovering the strongest disposition to avenge.

If, however, the old line of conduct be pursued. If nothing but defensive statements are made use of; if supplications be the last resort, let the Catholics make up their minds not to remain as they are, but to be a great deal worse treated than they have been. Silly insurrections, a sort of demi-rebellion, these are worse than nothing. They never can tend to good. Means will always be found to make it appear that the insurgents have nothing to complain of, and that they are naturally wicked and rebellious. But, are there not the means in the possessions of six or seven millions of Catholics, to make their voice heard throughout this Island? Every Session of Parliament gives ample opportunity for statement upon statement calculated to produce general impression. And if these opportunities be neglected, the sufferers will deserve their fate. But, never let it again escape the lips of a Catholic, that he entertains no hostility towards the established Church.

In conclusion, I should make, if I had room, some remarks upon the conduct of those who have so grossly imposed upon, deceived, misled, and would have disgraced if they could, that frank, honest, and unsuspecting gentleman, Mr. O'CONNELL. His letters, published both in England and in Ireland, leave no doubt, they can leave no doubt in the mind of any man, that he received the most positive and particular assurances, that the Catholic Bill would pass. Of this every man must be convinced. His great anxiety for the passing of the Bill, which he deemed so necessary to the happiness of his country, prevented him from taking that view of the matter which he would have taken, had he been in a state of less anxiety. We are not, therefore, to conclude him deficient in sagacity or in political knowledge. How is a man to be a match for the devil, unless he be at least half a devil himself?

How was he to doubt of the knowledge of those who deceived him; and his own candour and honesty, how are they to permit him to doubt of their sincerity; of this we may be well assured, that those who deceived him knew that they were deceiving him, that they meant to deceive him, and that they meant, if possible, to destroy his reputation. To be too ready to believe, to be too ready to forgive, to be too ready to repose confidence, are the faults of great and generous, and not of mean and little minds. The man of the most brilliant talents, of the largest views, of the most profound wisdom, is seldom a match for a cunning, though in most respects, an ignorant knave. Mr. O'CONNELL has been deceived; Ireland will impute it to his anxiety for her welfare, and she will, I trust, never cease to execrate his deceivers.

WM. COBBETT

## MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending May 7.

*Per Quarter.*

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat ..	68	6	Oats ....	24	4
Rye ....	39	7	Beans ...	37	5
Barley ..	36	3	Peas ....	36	3

*Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.*

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, May 7.

	Qrs.	£.	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat	6,295 for	22,813	5	2	Average,	72	5
Barley..	3,163	6,341	9	7	.....	40	1
Oats ....	9,299	12,800	13	11	.....	27	6
Rye ....	138	240	11	0	.....	34	10
Beans ..	651	1,214	10	10	.....	37	3
Peas ....	188	366	0	6	.....	38	11

Friday, May 13.—There have been very large supplies this week of nearly all descriptions of Grain. Superfine samples of Wheat alone meet purchasers at Monday's prices; other qualities are excessively dull. Barley has no alteration. Beans and Pease find buyers at last quotations. Oats meet a very slow sale, and prices are hardly equal to those of Monday last.

Monday, May 16.—Last week there were considerable arrivals of all sorts of Grain, except Irish Oats. This morning there are only small quanti-

ties of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas, fresh up from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, and not many vessels fresh in from the North, so that the market to-day is composed chiefly of the plentiful remains of former supplies. The Bill for admitting the Corn bonded prior to May 1822, and Canada Wheat, having passed the House of Commons, our Millers are, therefore, very reluctant in purchasing Wheat to-day, but the best qualities maintain last Monday's terms, whilst the middling and inferior are nearly unsaleable.

Barley is nearly unsaleable, and 1s. to 2s. per quarter cheaper than this day se'nnight. In Beans and Pease there is no variation from last quotations. Oats that are dry and sweet meet buyers at the terms last quoted, but unsweet qualities find a very dull sale. In the Flour trade there is no alteration.

Account of Wheat, &c. arrived in the Port of London, from May 9 to May 14, both inclusive.

	Qrs.		Qrs.
Wheat ..	13,336	Tares ....	2194
Barley ..	4,658	Linseed ..	3,610
Malt ....	7,390	Rapeseed .	360
Oats ....	25,715	Brank ..	656
Beans ...	2195	Mustard ..	100
Flour ....	10,276	Flax ....	—
Rye ....	—	Hemp ...	200
Peas .....	441	Seeds ...	67

Foreign.—Wheat, 5,430; Barley, 5,850; Oats, 400; Beans 30 qrs. and Flour 50 bushels.



Total Quantity of Corn returned as  
Sold in the Maritime Districts, for  
the Week ended May 7.

Qrs.	Qrs.
Wheat .. 42,721	Oats ... 29,809
Rye .... 384	Beans ... 4,325
Barley .. 17,749	Peas .... 665

Price of Bread.—The price of the  
4lb. Loaf is stated at 10½d. by the  
full-priced Bakers.

*Price on board Ship as under.*

Flour, per sack .....	60s. — 65s.
— Seconds .....	56s. — 60s.
— North Country .....	52s. — 55s.

Price of Hops per Cwt. in the  
Borough.

Monday, May 16.—The last week  
there has been a great deal done in  
both new and old Hops. Accounts  
from the plantations state, flies have  
appeared in various quarters, but it  
is yet early to say much about them.  
Old Hops may be stated at 4s. to 6s.  
dearer; New, 6s. to 10s.

Maidstone, May 12.—In the Hop  
Market here, we have little or no-  
thing doing, the few Hops in the  
Planters hands being of the growth  
of 1824, for which at present there is  
not much demand. The Bines have  
very much grown lately, are getting  
fast up the Poles, and look healthy.

Worcester, May 11.—Our market  
still continues very heavy; only nine  
pockets were weighed on Saturday:  
the plants have grown rapidly during  
the last few days, but it is remarked  
that they are irregular in their  
growth.

Monday, May 16.—The arrivals  
from Ireland last week were 322  
bales of Bacon; and from Foreign  
Ports 12,115 casks of Butter.

City, May 18, 1825.

## BACON.

The market continues heavy, from  
the great weight of the Stock, and  
the want of credit. Landed 55s.  
to 56s.

## BUTTER.

There is now a great abundance,  
and is selling at a great loss to the  
importers. No demand for Irish.  
Best Dutch, 82s. to 86s.

## CHEESE.

Cheshire, 66s. to 36s. Double  
Gloster, 66s. to 76s. Single, 60s.  
to 72s.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, May 16.

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).*

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	4	6	to	5 2
Mutton ...	5	0	—	5 8
Veal .....	6	0	—	7 0
Pork .....	5	6	—	6 0
Lamb .....	7	0	—	7 8

Beasts ... 2,589	Sheep .. 19,100
Calves ... 157	Pigs ... 150

NEWGATE, (same day.)

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).*

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	3	4	to	4 4
Mutton ...	3	6	—	5 2
Veal .....	4	4	—	6 4
Pork .....	4	0	—	6 0
Lamb .....	5	4	—	7 4

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead):*

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	3	6	to	4 6
Mutton ...	4	0	—	4 8
Veal .....	4	4	—	6 4
Pork .....	4	4	—	6 4
Lamb .....	5	8	—	7

## POTATOES.

## SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£3	0	to	£5	0
Middlings.....	2	5	—	2	10
Chats .....	2	5	—	0	0
Common Red..	0	0	—	0	0

## BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware .....	£3	0	to	£5	0
Middlings.....	2	0	—	2	10
Chats.....	1	10	—	2	0
Common Red..	3	0	—	4	10

## HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay....63s. to 95s.

Straw...36s. to 48s.

Clover.. 80s. to 105s.

Whitechapel.--Hay....66s. to 97s.

Straw...42s. to 48s.

Clover..84s. to 116s.

## COAL MARKET, May 13.

Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.

99½ Newcastle .. 54 27s.6d. to 38s.6d.

37½ Sunderland.. 23½ 28s.6d.—38s.6d.

## COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.			Barley.			Oats.			Beans.			Pease.		
	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.
Aylesbury .....	67	74	0	40	42	0	25	32	0	38	46	0	0	0	0
Banbury .....	68	72	0	40	45	0	24	30	0	36	48	0	0	0	0
Basingstoke ....	60	74	0	36	48	0	22	30	0	40	48	0	0	0	0
Bridport.....	64	72	0	33	38	0	26	0	0	46	48	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford.....	60	76	0	28	32	0	27	32	0	34	42	0	34	36	0
Derby.....	70	74	0	40	45	0	25	30	0	40	50	0	0	0	0
Devizes.....	60	74	0	34	48	0	25	42	0	42	56	0	0	0	0
Dorchester.....	56	76	0	32	41	0	25	32	0	42	54	0	0	0	0
Exeter.....	72	76	0	36	40	0	26	30	0	47	48	0	0	0	0
Eye .....	57	65	0	30	40	0	22	28	0	36	40	0	34	38	0
Guildford .....	62	83	0	34	44	0	23	33	0	40	48	0	0	0	0
Henley .....	64	80	0	34	46	0	24	30	0	40	50	0	40	44	0
Horncastle.....	56	66	0	28	38	0	16	24	0	36	42	0	0	0	0
Hungerford.....	61	80	0	32	44	0	25	34	0	42	56	0	0	0	0
Lewes .....	69	76	0	34	0	0	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newbury .....	55	82	0	33	42	0	20	30	0	32	44	0	0	0	0
Newcastle .....	53	68	0	22	42	0	18	27	0	36	40	0	36	54	0
Northampton....	68	76	0	42	46	0	23	30	0	39	44	0	0	0	0
Nottingham ....	66	0	0	44	0	0	25	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0
Reading .....	62	83	0	34	47	0	25	33	0	42	46	0	44	0	0
Stamford.....	64	72	0	38	43	0	22	30	0	36	42	0	0	0	0
Stowmarket ....	57	71	0	21	37	0	19	24	0	31	36	0	31	34	0
Swansea .....	72	0	0	40	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truro .....	76	0	0	41	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge .....	64	86	0	33	44	0	25	32	0	40	45	0	42	44	0
Warminster.....	53	72	0	33	50	0	22	33	0	36	54	0	0	0	0
Winchester.....	68	0	0	37	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalkeith* .....	33	38	0	28	34	0	17	21	0	19	21	0	19	21	0
Haddington*.....	30	38	0	28	35	0	15	21	0	16	20	0	16	20	0

\* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

*Liverpool, May 10.*—There was very little business done either here or in the country markets of this district since Tuesday last, in consequence of the late result of the motion for the relief of the bonded Grain. And at this day's market, dealers were extremely cautious in the few purchases of Grain made, although at a reduction of about 6*d.* per 70 lbs. on Wheat, 3*d.* per bushel on Barley and Malt, 1*s.* 6*d.* per sack on Flour, and on Oats 1*d.* to 2*d.* per 45 lbs.

Imported into Liverpool, from the 3*d.* to the 9*th* of May, 1825, inclusive:—Wheat, 9,086; Barley, 2,802; Oats, 21,305; Malt, 1,854; Beans, 315; Peas, 44 quarters. Flour, 628 sacks, per 280 lbs. Oatmeal, 490 packs, per 240 lbs. American Flour, 5,931 barrels.

*Norwich, May 14.*—The Corn trade was but moderately supplied with Wheat, and the millers having exhausted their stock, the trade was better than could be expected, after the fall in Mark Lane on Monday.

*Bristol, May 14.*—The business doing here in Corn, &c. is limited. The prices below quoted, are obtained for what is disposed of:—Wheat from 6*s.* 3*d.* to 9*s.*; Barley, 3*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.*; Beans, 3*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.*; Oats, 2*s.* 3*d.* to 3*s.* 3*d.*; and Malt, 5*s.* 6*d.* to 8*s.* per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30*s.* to 53*s.* per bag.

*Birmingham, May 12.*—Our trade was pretty generally heavy throughout to-day, but with scarcely any alteration of price. The supply of Wheat not so great as last week, and the farmer holds firm to the last quotations of this, and every other article.

*Ipswich, May 14.*—The supply of Corn to-day was extremely short, and there was but little disposition to purchase: Wheat and Barley were both cheaper.

*Wisbech, May 14.*—Wheat may be called from 1*s.* to 2*s.* per quarter lower, but in Oats, though short in supply, and other Grain, no material alteration from last week.

*Boston, May 11.*—The supply of Grain to-day is very small again, and owing to the dull state of the trade, there is little business doing, as the growers will not submit to a corresponding reduction with other markets. What has been done in Wheat, is at 4*s.* per quarter abatement from last week. Oats nearly maintain last week's prices. Barley is lower, and in no demand.

*Wakefield, May 13.*—The arrivals of Wheat are small this week, which, combined with the reduced stocks in granary, has caused the holders to remain more firm than was anticipated from the fall of price in Mark Lane.

*Hull, May 13.*—The supply of Wheat on Tuesday was tolerably large, but of all other Grain very limited. The farmers demanded full as high prices as on that day week, but could not succeed.

*Lynn, May 12.*—We had a good supply of Wheat at market on Tuesday, which met heavy sale at a decline of 3*s.* to 4*s.* per quarter. Barley must also be noted at a reduction of 1*s.* per quarter.

*Edinburgh, May 11.*—Our supply of Wheat to-day was rather larger than for some days past; and sales were flat, and prices on the decline.



## COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &amp;c.

*Norwich Castle Meadow, May 14.*—The show of Fat Cattle this day was large, and the sale not brisk, as the buyers were very reluctant to comply with the prices fixed, 7s. 6d. to 8s. 6d. per stone of 14 lbs. The supply of Store Cattle was also large, but not fine in quality; Scots, 4s. 6d. to 5s. 6d. per stone when fat; Short Horns, 3s. to 4s. 6d.; Cows and Calves, Home-breds, and Pigs, command high prices. The Sheep trade is also very high; Hoggetts in their Wool, from 30s. to 40s.; fat ones, from 44s. to 52s.; and the first pen of Lambs from off the Ewes this season, sold at 20s. 6d. each. Beef, 6½d. to 7½d.; Veal, 6d. to 8d.; Mutton, 6d. to 7½d.; and Pork, 7d. to 8d. per lb.

*Horncastle, May 14.*—Beef, 8s. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 8d.; Lamb, 10d.; Pork, 7d. to 7½d.; and Veal, 8d. to 9d. per lb.

*Bristol, May 12.*—Beef from 6½d. to 7d.; Mutton, 7d. to 8d.; and Pork, ½d. to 6½d. per lb. sinking offal.

At *Morpeth Market*, on Wednesday, there was a short supply of Cattle, which sold readily, at an advance in price; there being a good many Sheep, they met with rather dull sale, at last week's prices.—Beef, from 7s. to 7s. 9d.; Mutton, 9s. 4d. to 10s. per stone, sinking offal.

*Manchester, May 11.*—On sale 1,262 Sheep, at 7½d. to 8½d. per lb. sinking the offal; 285 Cattle, at 6½d. to 8½d.; 5 Pigs; 228 Lambs, at 9d. to 11d.—Total, 2380.

## AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended May 7, 1825.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
London* .....	70	7	38	5	26	2
Essex .....	71	5	33	6	26	2
Kent.....	71	7	40	9	25	9
Sussex.....	71	3	38	10	26	0
Suffolk .....	69	5	35	6	26	10
Cambridgeshire.....	67	8	35	5	22	0
Norfolk .....	67	5	33	6	25	6
Lincolnshire .....	67	2	39	9	22	2
Yorkshire .....	62	6	38	8	21	5
Durham .....	64	2	44	0	27	8
Northumberland .....	61	3	36	6	23	7
Cumberland .....	70	6	35	11	24	4
Westmoreland .....	73	8	36	0	25	7
Lancashire .....	67	7	0	0	25	0
Cheshire .....	68	6	51	7	25	0
Gloucestershire.....	71	4	40	2	33	8
Somersetshire .....	71	7	41	4	24	5
Monmouthshire .....	70	4	43	4	26	8
Devonshire.....	70	4	39	11	26	5
Cornwall.....	69	5	38	4	27	0
Dorsetshire .....	69	10	38	5	27	10
Hampshire .....	69	9	39	0	25	3
North Wales .....	69	1	43	5	22	5
South Wales ...	66	1	36	9	20	8

\* The London Average is always that of the Week preceding.